



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,875	09/23/2003	Zhengming Chen	6750-195-999	5169
20583	7590	09/12/2005	EXAMINER	
JONES DAY 222 EAST 41ST ST NEW YORK, NY 10017			BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/669,875

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Venkataraman Balasubramanian

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/5/04, 4/28/04

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

sd

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-54 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 27-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following apply. Any claim not specifically rejected is rejected as it is dependent on a rejected claim and shares the same indefiniteness.

1. Recitation of "a compound or pharmaceutically salt of a compound of the claim 1" in claims 27-29, 31, 33 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51 and 53 renders these claims and their dependent claims indefinite as it s is not clear what "compound" is referred to in the first choice. As recited it reads on any compound. An appropriate correction is needed

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 49-52 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating pain, anxiety, Parkinson's disease,

Art Unit: 1624

does not reasonably provide enablement for treatment any or all addictive disorder, any or all diseases, disorders or conditions including those yet to be linked with the mode of action embraced in the claim language. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant claims 49-52 are drawn as reach through claims wherein a mode of action is recited and then treatment of various diseases or disorders is embraced without adequate enabling disclosure. In this regard applicants attention is drawn to the court decision, wherein the court held that double Patenting applies between a mode of action and the treatment of disease if one of ordinary skill in the art would know of the connection between the two. See *Lilly vs. Barr*, 58 USPQ2d 1869, at 1879.

In the instant case compound of the invention is said to inhibit mGluR5-receptor and hence the use of the compounds to inhibit any cells expressing the said receptor with or without another therapeutic agent. Thus these claims indirectly embrace treating various diseases or disorders for which there is no enabling disclosure. The scope of the claims includes treatment of variety of diseases, disorders or conditions including any or addictive disorders as embraced in claim 33, which are not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds, provided in the specification. The instant compounds are disclosed have metabotropic glutamate receptor activity and it is recited that the instant compounds are useful in treating a variety of diseases for which applicants provide no competent evidence. Reading specification it appears that instant compound is useful for treating all sorts of diseases including various

Art Unit: 1624

neurodegenerative diseases or disorders, and various psychiatric disorders for which applicants have not provided any experimental support or nexus. Prior art searches do not lend support to, except for treating those cited above, for all diseases embraced in the claim language. That a single class of compounds can treat all these diseases /disorders is an incredible finding for which applicants have not provided enabling disclosure and prior art search at the time of instant invention suggest the use of these inhibitors is still under experimental stage and speculative in nature. Furthermore, the applicants have not provided any competent evidence that the instantly disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended host. Moreover many if not most of diseases such as Alzheimer's disease, multiple sclerosis, ALS, bipolar disorder etc. are very difficult to treat and at present there is no known drug, which can successfully lessen the course of these diseases, despite the fact that there are many drugs, which can be used for "inflammatory condition".

Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See *Ex parte Jovanovics*, 211 USPQ 907, 909; *In re Langer* 183 USPQ 288. Also note *Hoffman v. Klaus* 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and *Ex parte Powers* 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 66 FR 1092-1099, 2001, wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See *Wong et al.*, *Epilepsy Currents* 2 : 81-

Art Unit: 1624

85, 2002., and Spooren et al., *Drugs News Perspect.* 17(4) 251-257, 2004. (PubMed Abstracts provided)

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic uses of the compounds in treating several diseases of that require metabotropic glutamate receptor activity.

2) The state of the prior art: Recent publications at the time of instant invention suggest that antagonists of metabotropic glutamate receptor activity as therapeutic agents is still in experimental stage. See references cited above.

3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for the therapeutic effect of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show therapeutic effect

and the state of the art is that the effects metabotropic glutamate receptor activity inhibitors are still in experimental stage

6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace treatment of several diseases including those yet to be related to metabotropic glutamate receptor activity.

7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of ligand-receptor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards treating the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was 'filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-26 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Acting Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).


Venkataraman Balasubramanian

9/2/2005